DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 928 IR 050 805

AUTHOR Southwick, Neal S.
TITLE An Examination of Faculty Support toward the Learning Resources Center at Ricks College. Societal Factors Affecting Education.
PUB DATE Jun 84
NOTE 71p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; College Libraries; Facility Utilization Research; Higher Education; *Learning Resources Centers; *Library Research; Library Surveys; Literature Reviews; Questionnaires; *Teacher Attitudes; Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS Ricks College ID

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to determine the level of faculty support for the Learning Resources Center (LRC) at Ricks College, and to establish the degree of their encouraging student use of the LRC. The procedures used included a review of the literature, use of an inquiry committee of faculty and librarians to help identify pertinent questions to be included in a survey instrument, development of a survey questionnaire to gather data from the faculty, and computer tabulation of the survey questionnaire. The questionnaire was completed and returned by 155 of the 260 faculty to whom it was sent (60%). Results were tabulated by academic division for comparison and also cross-tabulated by sex, age, degree held, and years taught at Ricks College. The study indicated that the level of support from the faculty was lower than the LRC would like. It also showed that, while faculty believe that grades can be improved through student use of the LRC, they do not generally require their students to use the library. Recommendations are made to conduct further survey studies, initiate workshops or programs to promote faculty involvement, evaluate the quality of the LRC collection, engage in more promotional activities, and do a follow-up study within the next five years. (Author/DMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED247928

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

AN EXAMINATION OF FACULTY SUPPORT TOWARD THE LEARNING RESOURCES CENTER AT RICKS COLLEGE

SOCIETAL FACTORS AFFECTING EDUCATION

by

Neal S. Southwick, M.L.S.

Ricks College

PETER KASSEBAUM, Ed.D.

OAKLAND CLUSTER

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

JUNE 1984

IR050805

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Neal S. Southwick
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

Libraries are a vital part of every academic institution. Yet, students seem to avoid using them. Often, faculty support, as shown through class assignments or personal use, is low and students' patterns of library usage seldom varies significantly from faculty support patterns. At Ricks College the faculty support level appears to be low, thereby influencing student usage. The purposes of this practicum were to determine the level of support by the faculty and to establish the degree of their encouraging of student use of the LRC.

The procedures used to accomplish the purpose of this study included a review of literature, use of an inquiry committee of faculty and librarians to help identify pertinent questions to be included in a survey instrument, the development of a survey questionnaire to gather the data from the faculty, and the use of the IBM System 38 Computer for tabulation of the survey questionnaire.

The study indicated that the level of support from the faculty was lower than the LRC would like. Results were tabulated by academic division for comparison. The Social Science Division scored highest on a mean ranking of support level and the Industrial Science Division scored the lowest. The questionnaire was also cross-tabulated by sex, age, degree held, and years taught at Ricks College. There were few significant differences based on sex, age and degree held. Years taught provided the most responses

showing a significant difference in favor of longer residency. The study also showed that faculty believed that grades can improve through student use of the LRC. Yet, faculty also responded that they do not generally require their students to use the library.

Based on the results of this study, recommendations were made to conduct further survey studies, initiate workshops or programs to involve faculty more, evaluate the quality of the LRC collection, engage in more promotional activities, and do a follow-up study within the next five years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	2
PROCEDURES	6
Limitations	7
Assumptions	8
RESULTS	8
DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	28
Discussion	28
Implications for Ricks College	32
Recommendations	33
REFERENCES CITED	35
APPENDICES	
A LRC FACULTY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	37
B COVER LETTER FOR FACULTY SURVEY	41
C ALLEN STUDY FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE	43
D TABULATION OF SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE ALL QUESTIONS ALL FACULTY	45
E SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON SURVEY	50

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Percent of Questionnaire Respondents by Academic Division	10
2	Percentages of Demographic Data by Academic Division	11
3	Significant Differences Between Responses of Male and Female Faculty; by Question, Mean, Standard Deviation, t Value, and Degrees of Freedom; With a Critical t Value of 1.960.	12
4	Significant Differences Between Responses of Faculty According to Age; by Question, Mean, Standard Deviation, t Value, and Degrees of Freedom; With a critical t Value of 1.960.	14
5	Significant Differences Between Responses of Faculty According to Degree Held; by Question, Mean, Standard Deviation, t Value, and Degrees of Freedom; With a Critical t Value of 1.960.	15
6	Significant Differences Between Responses of Faculty According to Years Taught; by Question, Mean, Standard Deviation, t Value, and Degrees of Freedom; With a Critical t Value of 1.960.	17
7	Percentages of Faculty Perception of Students' Frequent-Use of the LRC; by Academic Division.	18
8	Percentages of Faculty Frequent-Use of the LRC; by Academic Division	19-20
9	Percentages of Positive Faculty Response to Other Input on LRC; by Academic Division	22
10	Ranked Mean of Questions 6, 12-15, 19-22, 25-36, and 41; Which Show Overall Faculty Support of the LRC; by Academic Division, Mean, Question Response, and Value of Response.	23
11	Ranked Mean of Question 37, How Well Could the Faculty Get Along Without the Services of the LRC; by Academic Division, Mean, Question Response, and Value of Response.	25

12 Ranked Mean of Questions 7-11, and 16; Which Show How Faculty Perceive Students' Needs Being Fulfilled by the LRC; by Academic Division, Mean, Question Response, and Value of Response 26

13 Ranked Mean of Questions 17 and 18; Which Show Perceived Noise Problem in the LRC; by Academic Division, Mean, Question Response, and Value of Response 27

14 A Comparison of Ricks College LRC Staff With the National Standard and With the Percentage of Institutions Meeting National Standard for Institutions Between 5,000-7,000 FTE 29

15 A Comparison of Ricks College LRC Collection With The National Standard and With The Percentage of Institutions Meeting National Standard for Institutions Between 5,000-7,000 FTE. 29

INTRODUCTION

For many college students today, the library seems to be an alien place. It not only houses books and other paper resources, such as magazines, newspapers and a myriad of indexes, but it may also include complex and perhaps huge computer retrieval systems. Yet the role of the academic library, according to Lynch and Seibert (1980:127) is of central and critical importance in meeting the instructional and scholarly needs of the college student. One could hardly visualize an academic institution that did not have a library with supportive resources. Kilpatrick (1980:9) said that the primary goal of a university education was to prepare students for a lifetime of self-directed learning. To help achieve this goal, professors should make library research an essential part of their course.

There are others who agree with the problem. Starkey (Lubans, 1974:176) commented:

> Too many of our college students lack library proficiency. All students should have some library use instruction so that they can competently and conficently deal with information resources. It is in the library the students ideally should begin their quest for social, cultural, and intellectural maturation. In this spirit each professor should strive to stimulate each student toward library use.

Gwinn (1978:19) observed, "Most students will use library materials in their courses only if professors require them to." Kilpatrick (1980:19) added, "When reinforced by the professor, such student efforts can result in a definite expansion of the classroom experience." Lyle (1974:112) very aptly points out:

> It is only too generally known that college students often do not understand how to locate and use library resources even though librarians believe such knowledge is basic to their studies and even though an enormous amount of time, money, and experimentation have gone into trying to find a solution to this problem. The trouble in the past has not been that students have had difficulty in mastering the technique of using the library efficiently. They just have not bothered to learn how to use the library, and their professors' methods of teaching have not encouraged them to do so.

The problem described is not foreign to the Ricks College Library, which is called a Learning Resources Center (LRC). In an interview, the LRC director (Ostler 1983), made the following comments:

> A good many of the students come through our doors, but we wonder about the quality of their work in the LRC. We are also concerned that faculty usage appears low and we have little evidence that faculty encourage their students to use the LRC."

The purposes of this study were to determine the level of support by the faculty and to establish the degree of their encouraging student use of the LRC. Once this information was known, specific programs could be initiated to assist the faculty in meeting the needs of their students more effectively. In order to fulfill the purpose of this practicum, similar studies at other institutions were reviewed, and data for this study was collected through the use of a questionnaire that was developed by a faculty/librarian committee and sent to all faculty members.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Many colleges and universities recognize the importance that faculty influence has had on library usage by students. Gwinn (1978:29) states that in 1976 Cornell University started a

course-related service where librarians lectured to students on resources and search strategies directly related to classroom assignments. The administration was so impressed with the success and popularity of the project, it approved additional staff and pledged continued university support.

Hofmann (1981) pointed out that Miami-Dade Community College South Campus conducted faculty library workshops in which faculty members were oriented to library services and ways in which they could guide students in library research. Following these workshops there was a dramatic increase in the use of many of the library services and resources. The cooperation between faculty and librarians to achieve a more effective academic experience was also viewed as one of the most valuable outcomes of the workshop.

A review of the literature indicated that faculty support of the library was an important and current issue. This support, or lack of support, occurs in several ways. Thomson (1975:76) stated that "the main key to student use was faculty expectation and requirement." For instructional purposes, Lubans (1978:110) commented, "Few would argue that close faculty-librarian relationships are the key to a successful instruction program." Biggs (1981:188) brought out the fact that sometimes lack of support on the part of faculty is traced to the librarians' unwillingness to allow the faculty to be involved in library problems and in the formulation of solutions. She (1981:189) goes on to suggest that in order "to obtain optimal cooperation, it is essential for librarians to formulate a clear, long-range, rational plan . . . and communicate it systematically to all professors and administrators."

In a study of faculty usage of the library on the university level, MacVean (1978:7) found that forty-two percent of the faculty were non-users. Sargent's (1979:417) study revealed that the pattern of student usage of the library did not seem to vary significantly from the pattern of faculty usage. Davis 91979:529-30) pointed out in a study on faculty perceptions of academic libraries that the length of time at the institution seemed to be the most significant factor determining faculty library usage. A study of library use patterns at San Jose State University (Whitlatch 1983:145) indicated that only one-third of the full-time faculty made frequent use of the library.

In discussing the progress that has been made (or supposed to have been made) in educating the library user in recent years, Lubans (1978:2) made the following interesting observations:

> My personal standard has been the degree to which we have been able to convince the teacher or faculty member that library instruction is good and the degree to which, as a result, the teacher works with the library in inculcating this bit of wisdom into the heads of students.
>
> If there is one subjective indicator of progress, it is the general acceptance by librarians of not having to go it alone. The realization at the grass roots level that teachers are crucial to library instructional success or failures does appear to be more prevalent than in previous decades.
>
> If we have realized the importance of the faculty-librarian connection. What is it that impedes the next phase of a wholehearted acceptance by teachers of the benefits accruing to themselves and their students from information finding and using skills?

Lubans (1978:3) continued by suggesting that the "frequently called for partnership" between the faculty member and the librarian, is what is needed. The librarian should have a teaching role both in a class situation at a specialized level and outside of it on a tutorial basis. This teaching role of the librarian, should be

in conjunction with the regular teacher. Then students could achieve and maintain proficiency in library use while still in school. A long range benefit also emerges for these students when they find that they are able to function within a library beyond their college years.

A recent study (Tierno 1983:284) described a project which focused on faculty-centered library research instruction. In it, faculty and librarians designed library experiences that were integrated into the required course assignments. The data obtained from this study strongly suggested that students' skills in library usage as well as their attitude towards such efforts were significantly improved.

The reputation of cooperative efforts between faculty and librarians is generally negative (Longsdon 1970). Yet, where constructive efforts have been tried, positive results have usually come, as indicated above. Therefore, if library resources are to be used on college campuses, there must be strong and positive support from faculty.

This study fits well into the core module of Societal Factors Affecting Education for two major reasons. First, the faculty, librarians, and students on college campuses comprise a society. And second, the functioning and cooperative effort of each segment of this society affects the educational quality and well-being of the whole.

The significance of this study to Ricks College can be viewed in light of what is stated in the Mission Statement (1979:1) of the LRC:

> The Learning Resources Center will play an active role in supporting the academic needs of the college including the educational and economic advantages of new technology. it feels a responsibility to provide information concerning instructional procedures, student learning and programs that lead to instructional improvement from a wide variety of sources.

In order to adequately meet the objectives as stated in the LRC Mission Statement, cooperation between faculty members and librarians in helping students to make effective use of the library is essential.

PROCEDURES

In order to accomplish the purposes of this study the following procedures were implemented:

1) The literature was reviewed to discover similar studies at other institutions.

2) A group of librarians and faculty were interviewed to help identify pertinent questions that were to be included on a survey questionnaire. Following these interviews the questionnaire was devised. It contained five demographic questions dealing with age, sex, degree earned, years taught at Ricks College, and department. These items were included so that they could be used as variables in analyzing the results of the questionnaire. The bulk of the questions were constructed following a rating scale (Best 1981:162) which determined the frequency of use of library materials either by the students or by the faculty, but only as perceived by the faculty. The last few questions dealt with other issues pertinent to library usage (see Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire). A survey questionnaire was chosen as the method to collect the data because of the amount of data needed and because

the population was large. The survey questionnaire is "considered as a method of systematic data collection" (Borg 1979:283).

3) The questionnaire was pre-tested with a group of ten faculty members. All were asked to respond to the questions, to comment on the validity of their content, and to watch for possible ambiguity. Following the pre-test, the questionnaire was revised.

4) Questionnaires were administered to the entire faculty (260) through campus mail. A cover letter written by the LRC director accompanied the questionnaire (see Appendix B for copy of cover letter). Two weeks after the questionnaire had been sent out, a notice was put in the faculty bulletin asking non-respondents to please return it.

5) Following receipt of the questionnaires the results were tabulated by the IBM system 38 computer, with the findings described in the results section.

Limitations

There were four major limitations of this study: (1) the timing was poor. The survey questionnaire was administered to the faculty within a month of the end of the school year. Because of busy schedules, the response was less than desired. The hoped for response was eighty percent and the actual response reached only sixty percent; (2) the questionnaire was too long for easy response; (3) the design of the survey questionnaire could have been simplified. For example, the respondents were required to mark their answers on a separate computer scored sheet which took more time, effort,

and concentration; and (4) forty-one respondents chose not to identify their academic division. Therefore, the division breakdown statistics do not include these respondents.

Assumptions

Three major assumptions were involved in the significance of this study: (1) if students were effective library users, the quality of their education should be improved; (2) if faculty were positive advocates of library usage, the educational atmosphere of Ricks College would be enhanced; and (3) inasmuch as each division was represented by at least thirty-six percent of their faculty, the total of sixty percent response was felt adequate to be representative.

RESULTS

A review of the literature revealed that several studies had been done at other academic libraries. One of the most useful was conducted by Kenneth Allen (1971) involving three different community colleges in Illinois: Illinois Central College, Shawnee Community College, and Waubonsee Community College. His survey was short, asking only nine questions (see Appendix C for a copy of the questionnaire). The questions dealt with use of the library by both faculty and students.

A survey by Scott (1977) at Wytheville Community College included information on audio/visual usage. A survey by Wilson (1976) at Virginia Western Community College divided his study into three major areas: audio-visual department, learning laboratory,

end library. Not only did Wilson ask for usage figures, but he also rated the quality of service.

Three faculty surveys at four-year universities were reviewed; the University of Toledo, Ohio; Western Illinois University; and State University of New York. The only one that was helpful was the survey by Gratch (1980) at State University of New York. This survey found faculty expectations of library use by students to be very high, an assumption that could be anticipated for a four-year institution.

The survey questionnaires of these studies were helpful in building the instrument to be used at Ricks College. Also, the input from the local group of librarians and faculty was helpful because it pertained directly to Ricks College. Sixty percent of the questionnaires were returned by the faculty as shown in Table 1 on page 10. This rate compares with a low of thirty-nine percent respondents on the State University of New York survey, and a high of ninty-four percent return on the Allen (1971) survey of three Illinois community colleges.

The survey generated a great amount of statistical data. A complete tabulation of the results to all questions is shown in Appendix D. The tables which follow show the data broken down into the important categories. Table 2 on page 11, shows the percentages of the demographic data by academic division. This data proved useful in determining that there were some significant differences within each category. In the sex category, there were four questions that showed a significant difference, with female faculty members scoring higher on each one. As is shown in Table 3 on page 12,

Table 1

Percent of Questionnaire Respondents by Academic Division

Academic Division	Questionnaires Sent	Questionnaires Returned	%
Agriculture	14	6	43%
Arts and Letters	58	21	36%
Industrial Science	16	8	50%
Natural Science	51	27	53%
Religious and Family Living	59	24	41%
Social Science	44	23	52%
Administration	18	5	28%
Unidentified		41	
Total	260	155	60%

Table 2

Percentages of Demographic Data by Academic Division

Demographic Data	Agriculture	Arts and Letters	Industrial Science	Natural Science	Religious & Family Living	Social Science	Administration	Unidentified	College Total
N =	(6)	(21)	(8)	(27)	(24)	(23)	(5)	(41)	(155)
Sex: Male	100	81	88	96	50	91	100	73	80
Female	-	19	12	4	50	9	-	27	20
Age: 30 or under	-	5	-	-	17	-	-	8	5
31 - 40	17	37	12	11	25	13	40	20	21
41 - 50	49	29	50	70	46	52	40	41	48
51 - 60	17	29	38	19	12	26	20	29	24
61 or over	17	-	-	-	-	9	-	2	2
Highest Degree:									
Bachelors	-	5	12	8	17	-	-	10	8
Masters	50	71	63	59	58	65	60	61	62
Doctorate	50	24	25	33	25	35	40	29	30
Years taught at Ricks:									
5 or less	50	18	25	4	29	17	20	24	21
6 - 10	17	10	12	11	17	5	-	12	11
11 - 15	33	38	63	48	46	52	80	24	42
16 - 20	-	10	-	30	4	17	-	24	16
21 or over	-	24	-	7	4	9	-	16	10

Table 3

Significant Differences Between Responses of Male and Female Faculty; by Question, Mean, Standard Deviation, t Value, and Degrees of Freedom; With a Critical t Value of 1.960

Question on Survey	N =	Mean Male (124)	Mean Female (31)	Standard Deviation Male (124)	Standard Deviation Female (31)	t	df
14. Placing Materials on Reserve		2.115	2.633	1.24	1.03	2.114	150
19. Use of library for bachelor's degree		2.869	3.276	.93	.80	2.180	149
23. LRC collection adequate for professional research		1.800	2.227	.88	.97	2.031	125
30. Having materials prepared in media production area		1.525	2.129	1.09	1.23	2.680	151

the t value of all four questions surpassed the critical value of t at the .05 level of significance (Ferguson 1976:487).

The age category was originally divided into five groups of ten year intervals starting at thirty or under. However, it was found that the two groups under forty years of age were very similar. Likewise the three groups of over forty years were also quite similar. Therefore, the data was combined into two groups for comparison; those forty years and under and those forty-one years and above. As shown in Table 4 on page 14, there were four questions which showed a significant difference based on the critical value of t at the .05 level of significance (Ferguson 1976:487). In all four of these questions, the forty-one and over group scored higher.

In the degree category, there were few differences between the responses of those holding the master's degree and those holding the doctorate degree. Therefore, They were grouped together and compared against the responses of those holding the bachelor's degree. As shown in Table 5 on page 15, there were only three questions that showed a significant difference, based on the critical value of t at the .05 level of significance (Ferguson 1976:487). In all three responses, those holding graduate degrees scored higher.

The category that had the most questions with a significant difference was the "years taught" classification. There were eleven questions in this grouping that exceeded the critical t value at the .05 level of significance (Ferguson 1976:487). This category was also re-grouped for a more meaningful comparison; those who had taught ten years or less and those who had taught eleven years

Table 4

Significant Differences Between Responses of Faculty According tn Age; by Question, Mean, Standard Deviation, t Value, and Degrees of Freedom; With a Critical t Value of 1.960

Question on Survey	N=	Mean 40 and Under (40)	Mean 41 and over (115)	Standard Deviation 40 rnd under (40)	Standard Deviation 41 and over (115)	t	df
6. Utilization of LRC necessary for student success		2.154	2.632	.90	.99	2.659	151
7. LRC Book collection fills student needs		2.114	2.561	.83	.86	2.687	140
12. Students are required to use LRC to complete class assignments		1.923	2.321	.98	1.08	2.023	149
13. Students are encouraged to use LRC for cours work		2.026	2.540	1.03	1.04	2.650	149

Table 5

Significant Differences Between Responses of Faculty According to Degree Held; by Question, Mean, Standard Deviation, t Value, and Degrees of Freedom; With a Critical t Value of 1.960

Question on Survey	N =	Mean Bachelors (12)	Mean Masters/Doc (143)	Standard Deviation Bachelors (12)	Standard Deviation Masters/Doc (143)	t	df
11. LRC Media collection fills students' needs		2.000	2.678	1.11	.95	2.035	122
28. Faculty use of A/V or media collection		1.636	2.566	1.03	1.06	2.813	152
32. Faculty request LRC to purchase materials		1.636	2.404	1.29	1.04	2.314	150

or more. As can be seen from Table 6 on page 17, the "eleven years and over" group scored significantly higher on all eleven questions.

The rest of the survey questionnaire was divided into three classifications: (1) faculty perception of student use of the LRC; (2) faculty use of the LRC; and (3) other faculty input about the LRC. Table 7 on page 18, shows the percentages of each academic division regarding the faculty's perception of student use of the LRC. It should be noted that these are percentages of those who answered either "very frequently" or "frequently" on the survey. The LRC was not willing to accept the answers of "occasionally," "rarely," or "never" as indications of adequate service rendered (Ostler 1984); therefore, these answers were looked at as being negative. As can be seen from Table 7 on page 18, the Social Science Division had more high percentages than the other divisions. One interesting paradox appears in questions twelve, thirteen, and fifteen. Question fifteen asks: How often will the use of the LRC help improve the grades of your students? Fifty-two percent of the faculty responded "frequently" or "very frequently." Yet, when asked in question thirteen, how often they encouraged their students to use the LRC, only forty-six percent responded with "frequently" or "very frequently." And worse, when asked, in question twelve, how often they required their students to use the LRC in completing assignments, only thirty-seven percent responded favorably. In a study that measured the relationship of library use to academic achievement, Russell (1982:4) reported in the results that GPA was positively related to library use.

Table 8 on pages 19-20, shows the percentages of faculty

Table 6

Significant Differences Between Responses of Faculty According to Years Taught; by Question, Mean, Standard Deviation, t Value, and Degrees of Freedom; with a Critical t Value of 1.960

Question on Survey	N =	Mean 10 - (49)	Mean 11 + (106)	Standard Deviation 10 - (49)	Standard Deviation 11 + (106)	t	df
6. Utilization of LRC necessary for stu success		2.167	2.667	.83	1.02	2.980	151
7. LRC book collection fills student needs		2.116	2.596	.88	.83	3.104	140
12. Students are required to use LRC		1.792	2.417	.99	1.05	3.467	149
13. Students are encouraged to use LRC		2.043	2.577	1.00	1.04	2.959	149
14. Materials are placed on reserve		1.833	2.394	1.12	1.23	2.694	150
15. LRC use will improve grades of students		2.378	2.743	1.11	.98	1.995	144
22. LRC coll is adequate for teaching needs		2.442	2.776	.93	.82	2.133	139
25. Faculty use of book collection		2.064	2.462	.96	.95	2.386	151
26. Faculty use of periodical collection		1.936	2.333	1.07	.92	2.341	150
28. Faculty use of a/v or media collection		2.104	2.679	1.02	1.07	3.148	152
30. Having materials prepared in media prod area		1.149	1.849	.98	1.15	3.624	151

Table 7

Percentages of Faculty Perception of Students' Frequent-Use of the LRC; by Academic Division

Question on Survey	Agri	Arts/ Let	Ind/ Sci	Nat/ Sci	Rel/ Fam	Soc/ Sci	Adm	Unid/ Div	Total
N=	(6)	(21)	(8)	(27)	(24)	(23)	(5)	(41)	(155)
6. Utilization necessary for student success	50	62	38	52	21	73	40	44	48
7. Book collection fills students' needs	50	53	26	48	50	74	60	37	48
8. Periodical collection fills students' needs	50	34	26	41	42	47	60	43	41
9. Index collection fills students' needs	67	29	13	26	37	56	60	29	35
10. Reference collection fills students' needs	50	48	26	48	37	61	100	36	46
11. Media collection fills students' needs	34	38	13	52	71	60	60	37	48
12. Students required to use LRC for assignments	33	38	26	26	21	70	60	34	37
13. Students encouraged to use LRC for course work	50	57	38	34	46	73	60	32	46
14. Materials are placed on reserve for students	17	38	50	49	34	60	20	32	40
15. Use of LRC helps improve students grades	34	53	63	52	46	78	60	39	52
16. Students understand how to locate materials	50	34	38	26	21	26	60	20	27
17. Students feel there is a noise problem in LRC	34	67	38	48	38	65	80	41	50
18. Faculty feel there is a noise problem in LRC	34	64	13	56	38	65	80	52	52

Table 8

Percentages of Faculty Frequent-Use of the LRC; by Academic Division

Question on Survey	N =	Agri (6)	Arts/ Let (21)	Ind/ Sci (8)	Nat/ Sci (27)	Rel/ Fam (24)	Soc/ Sci (23)	Admin (5)	Unid/ Div (41)	Total (155)
19. Use of library for bachelor's degree		34	66	76	48	63	87	80	74	67
20. Use of library for master's degree		83	95	86	80	80	91	100	89	87
21. Use of library for doctorate degree		67	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	96
22. LRC collection adequate for teaching respon		67	48	25	70	63	79	80	51	60
23. LRC collection adequate for prof research		17	19	13	19	21	34	20	17	21
24. LRC collection adequate for leisure use		66	57	63	67	42	65	80	48	57
25. Faculty use of LRC book collection		50	57	13	48	30	43	60	29	39
26. Faculty use of LRC periodical collection		50	38	25	41	26	48	60	36	38
27. Faculty use of LRC index collection		33	29	-	19	25	22	40	19	22
28. Faculty use of LRC media collection		33	62	13	48	50	73	40	56	54
29. Faculty use of LRC gov doc collection		17	5	-	11	-	17	-	7	8

Table 8 (Continued)

Percentages of Faculty Frequent-Use of the LRC; by Academic Division

Question on Survey	N =	Agri (6)	Arts/ Let (21)	Ind/ Sci (8)	Nat/ Sci (27)	Rel/ Fam (24)	Soc/ Sci (23)	Admin (5)	Unid/ Div (41)	Total (155)
30. Have materials prepared in media prod area		17	29	-	14	46	21	40	7	20
31. Satisfied with service of a/v department		67	81	38	82	92	82	100	80	81
32. Request LRC to purchase materials		50	58	38	48	25	48	60	39	43
33. Satisfied with handling purchase requests		67	72	38	78	62	82	100	66	70
34. Ask for help when assistance is needed		50	62	38	55	83	83	80	56	64
35. Receive quality help from prof librarians		83	72	63	89	88	86	80	86	83
36. Receive quality help from student workers		50	24	13	33	55	35	40	39	37
37. How well could teach classes without LRC		50	38	75	34	54	21	40	59	47

use of the LRC. Again, the percentages show the positive usage of "frequently" or "very frequently." The Social Science Division once more scores the highest among the academic divisions. Some interesting percentages appear on this table. Only sixty percent of the faculty feel that the LRC collection is adequate for their teaching responsibilities, as reported in question twenty-two. Question thirty-seven reports a disturbing fact that forty-seven percent of the faculty said that they could teach their classes well without the existence of the LRC. On the positive side, more than eighty percent of the faculty were satisfied with the service they had received from the reference librarians and from the audio-visual department.

Table 9 on page 22, completes the compilation of the survey questions by percentage. Three items are worthy of mention. First, over half of the faculty responded positively to attending workshops that would help them with LRC usage, as indicated in questions thirty-eight, thirty-nine, and forty. Second, when asked in question forty-one, how they would respond to a "library tour," the reply was very negative. Third, thirty-four percent of the faculty respondents made additional comments on the questionnaire (see Appendix E for a summary of comments).

Another categorization of the survey questionnaire was done in order to rank the academic divisions. Four categories were pulled from the questionnaire: (1) overall support of the LRC; (2) how well the faculty could function without the LRC; (3) how the faculty perceive students' needs being fulfilled; and (4) how the faculty perceived noise to be a problem in the LRC. Table 10 on page 23,

Table 9

Percentages of Positive Faculty Response To Other Input on LRC; by Academic Division

Question on Survey	N =	Agri (6)	Arts/ Let (21)	Ind/ Sci (8)	Nat/ Sci (27)	Rel/ Fam (24)	Soc/ Sci (23)	Admin (5)	Univ/ Div (41)	Total (155)
38. Interested in attending "personal use" workshop		100	43	63	52	71	65	60	63	61
39. Interested in attending "student use" workshop		83	48	50	48	54	61	40	49	52
40. Interested in having a libn teach your students		83	67	38	52	46	74	40	44	54
41. Response to LRC tours										
a. Bring class to LRC		33	29	13	11	25	22	20	20	21
b. Send students to LRC		17	33	24	19	29	26	-	17	23
c. Class does not need a tour		-	14	13	15	13	13	-	12	12
d. Make lib orient part of freshman orient		17	19	50	48	33	30	80	37	36
e. No response		33	5	-	7	-	9	-	14	8
42. Which title for LRC preferred										
a. Library		50	76	63	78	79	48	60	51	64
b. LRC		17	5	37	15	13	22	-	24	17
c. Either		17	19	-	7	8	26	40	24	17
d. No response		16	-	-	-	-	4	-	1	2
43. Comments made on survey		33	33	38	37	25	57	20	27	34

Table 10

Ranked Mean of Questions 6, 12-15, 19-22, 25-36, and 41; Which Show Overall Faculty Support of the LRC; by Academic Division, Mean, Question Response, and Value of Response

Academic Division	Mean	Question Response	Value of Response
Social Science	2.839	Very Frequently	4.000
Arts and Letters	2.598	Frequently	3.000
Natural Science	2.457	Occasionally	2.000
Agriculture	2.449	Rarely	1.000
Religious and Family	2.439	Never	0.000
Industrial Science	2.131		
All Divisions	2.513		

shows the ranking of overall support by academic division. The scale of response is also listed to show the value of the mean. The Social Science Division ranks the highest with a mean of 2.839. This puts that division very close to the "frequently" response level. Seven questions were not included in Table 10 which also do not appear in any of the other three categories. Questions twenty-three and twenty-four, which asked about professional research needs and leisure needs, were omitted because there would be too many specialized situations regulating the responses. Questions thirty-eight, thirty-nine, forty, forty-two, and forty-three had a different scale of rating and could not be included (see Tables 8 and 9 for a listing of these questions).

Table 11 on page 25, handles only question thirty-seven, which asks how well the faculty could get along without the LRC. The Social Science Division again scored the best. This scale is in reverse, as a lower mean indicates that the LRC is needed more.

The faculty perception of how frequently the students' needs are being met by the LRC is shown in Table 12, on page 26. The Agriculture Division scored the highest here with a mean of 2.933, followed by the Social Science Division with a mean of 2.716. Table 13 on page 27, shows the perceived noise problem in the LRC. The Social Science Division leads the way again with a mean of 3.104. It is interesting that the Social Science Division would have the highest rating of support for the LRC and yet also have the highest rating for noise being a problem in the LRC.

Table 11

Ranked Mean of Question 37, How Well Could the Faculty Get Along Without the Services of the LRC; by Academic Division Mean, Question Response, and Value of Response

cademic Division	Mean	Question Response	Value of Response
ocial Science	1.087	Very well	3.000
rts and Letters	1.333	Well	2.000
atural Science	1.440	Not very well	1.000
eligious and Family	1.458	Not at all	0.000
griculture	1.667		
ndustrial Science	2.250		
ll Divisions	1.467		

Table 12

Ranked Mean of Questions 7-11, and 16; Which Show How Faculty Perceive Students' Needs Being Fulfilled by the LRC; by Academic Division, Mean, Question Response and Value of Response

Academic Division	Mean	Question Response	Value of Response
Agriculture	2.933	Very Frequently	4.000
Social Science	2.716	Frequently	3.000
Natural Science	2.457	Occasionally	2.000
Religious and Family	2.399	Raraely	1.000
Arts and Letters	2.296	Never	0.000
Industrial Science	1.890		
All Divisions	2.410		

Table 13

Ranked Mean of Questions 17 and 18; Which Show Perceived Noise In the LRC; by Academic Division, Mean, Question Response, and Value of Response

Academic Division	Mean	Question Response	Value of Response
Social Science	3.104	Very Frequently	4.000
Arts and Letters	2.924	Frequently	3.000
Natural Science	2.883	Occasionally	2.000
Agriculture	2.834	Rarely	1.000
Religious and Family	2.618	Never	0.000
Industrial Science	2.012		
All Divisions	2.822		

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

Lyle (1974:9) stated, "There can be little question that library facilities are vital to the undergraduate college of arts and sciences." If this is true, then two things must occur in order that the maximum benefit be achieved. One, the library must contain sufficient material to support the educational programs of the college. And two, the students and faculty must use the materials and facility so that education in its best form can occur. Since this study focused only on the second item, a brief discussion of the Ricks College LRC collection will help to better understand the analysis of the usage survey.

In order to determine if the Ricks College LRC can provide materials and services for its population, a comparison with the standards for two-year college libraries is in order. The comparison centers on LRC staff, collection, and budget. The comparison also includes the national percentage of two-year college libraries that meet or exceed the minimum standard (Carpenter 1981). Table 14 on page 29 shows the staff comparison. Ricks College LRC exceeds the minimum standard for both professional and support staff. However, because of the high number of professional staff, the ratio between professional and support staff is under the national standard. The library collection comparison (LRC inventory 1983) is shown in Table 15, also on page 29. Ricks College overwhelmingly exceeds the standards here, except for the annual book acquisition of five percent. However, five percent of the minimum collection size is

Table 14

A Comparison of Ricks College LRC Staff With The National Standard and With The Percentage of Institutions Meeting the National Standard For Institutions Between 5,000-7,000 FTE

Staff	Ricks	National Standard	Percentage Meeting National Standard
Professional	10	6	25%
Support	16	15	5%
Ratio	1:1.6	1:2	14%

Table 15

A Comparison of Ricks College LRC Collection With The National Standard and With The Percentage of Institutions Meeting The National Standard For Institutions Between 5,000-7,000 FTE

Collection	Ricks	National Standard	Percentage Meeting National Standard
Books	120,813	50,000	21%
Periodical Subscriptions	815	700	8%
Audio-Visual	22,169	6,050	38%
Annual Book Acquisition	4.2%	5%	63%

2,500 items and during the academic year 1982-83 Ricks Colelge acquired almost 5,000 books, which was still only 4.2% of its current collection. Also three other collections are not shown in Table 15; maps, government documents and microforms. In these collections the Ricks College LRC has 13,420 maps, 197,787 government documents, and 122,404 microforms.

On the budget the national standard is for the library to have 7-12% of the institutional budget. Ricks College LRC has 6.4% of the institutional budget. Nationally only 11% of the two-year colleges reach the level of 7-12%.

It would appear from the above comparisons, that the Ricks College LRC collection is more than adquate for its student size. Compared with the national mean this would be an enviable position in which to be. However, from this study only sixty percent of the Ricks College faculty felt that the LRC collection was adequate for their teaching responsibilities. Therefore, size is not the only important measurement when it come to assessing an academic library.

This study was designed to assess the level of faculty support for the LRC. Several conclusions seem to predominate. First, for most of the survey questions there were no significant differences in the responses categorized by sex, age, degree held, and years taught. Second, the questions that did appear to be significantly different in each category were not the same questions. The only correlation between these categories appeared in the "age" and "years taught" groups, dealing with questions six, seven, twelve and thirteen. In all of these, the faculty who had been at Ricks College

longer than ten years and who were over forty years of age scored significantly higher. These four questions dealt with utilization of LRC necessary for student success, book collection filling student needs, students required to use the LRC, and students encouraged to use the LRC. Therefore, the older faculty seem to believe in the LRC and have their students use it more.

Third, the personal use of the LRC by faculty was significantly higher for those who had been at Ricks College longer than ten years. This substantiates a study by Nelson (1973) wherein he had also used ten years of service as the dividing line. He showed that faculty who had taught at the college longer had a higher level of awareness of library services. This data suggests that the librarians should focus some appropriate public relations attention in the direction of the new and/or younger faculty.

Fourth, the overall support ranking seemed to be significant. The survey showed that the faculty from the Social Science Division gave the most support with a mean of 2.839. This put the faculty from this division nearly at the level of being frequent library users. The faculty from the division of Industrial Science gave the least support with a mean ranking of 2.131. This put them just slightly above the occasional level of library use. It was no surprise then, to see the division of Social Science say they could not get along without the services of the LRC (as shown in Table 11), while on the other hand, the Division of Industrial Science indicated that they could get along without the LRC quite well. This is not unlike the Whitlatch (1983:147) study at San Jose State University, wherein the school of Social Science had the highest

percentage (50.7%) of frequent library use by the faculty. The schools of Engineering and Applied Arts (which are in the Division of Industrial Science at Ricks College) were among the lowest percentages, 23.2% and 24.3% respectively.

Another interesting correlation occurred between Table 10, which showed overall faculty support, and Table 12, which showed faculty perception of students needs being fulfilled by the LRC. The mean scores were very nearly identical, substantiating an earlier cited study by Sargent (1979:417), in which he indicated that student usage of the library does not seem to vary significantly from the pattern of faculty usage.

Implications for Ricks College

A library exists to serve its patrons. A service organization must always consider the needs of its clientele above its own needs. The results of this study indicated several important findings. First, too many faculty felt that the LRC was not meeting their teaching responsibility needs. Second, the government document collection is greatly underused. Third, there is a definite noise problem in the LRC. Fourth, on a positive note, the service rendered by the LRC was rated high. Fifth, it appears that far too few faculty require LRC use by their students. In an academic setting the requirements should be high. And Sixth, the faculty would respond to workshops which would help them in using the LRC more.

This study showed that the overall support of the LRC was not "bad," but lower than library personnel would like to be. The reasons may vary all the way from "too noisy" to "my discipline

does not require library usage." And yet, any reason should be viewed as a challenge to be met by the innovating library staff.

Recommendations

As a result of this study the following recommendations are given to the LRC director for serious consideration:

1) Conduct a "library support" survey among students to see if the faculty perception of their use or non-use was accurate.

2) Conduct a "utilization of the LRC" survey concentrating on students or faculty who are coming into the LRC. The value of this type of survey would be to determine if perceived support reflected actual utilization. The Allen (1971:75) study found utilization patterns to be lower than support attitudes of both faculty and students.

3) Initiate programs or workshops in which the LRC can be more directly involved with faculty and their teaching role, such as:

a) Meet with each department on campus to offer services and to elicit suggestions.

b) Conduct a workshop for faculty personal use of the LRC.

c) Conduct a workshop to teach faculty how to have students effectively incorporate the LRC into their studies.

d) Set up a program in which librarians can work jointly with faculty on orienting their students to library research.

e) Set up an inservice program for new faculty wherein a series of mini-workshops can be presented throughout

their first two or three years.

4) Evaluate the quality of the LRC collection using a faculty committee to assist and give recommendations. The faculty on this committee should be representative of each discipline on campus and should be given some released time from their teaching load to accomplish this review. This evaluation could take up to five years, concentrating on a certain portion each year.

5) Set up an active program promoting the use of the government documents collection. This is a large and valuable collection that is virtually untouched. And yet, during the academic year 1982-83 over $42,000 was spent adding federal and state government documents to the LRC collection.

6) Take a serious look at the noise problem in the LRC. The perceived problem is high and could be a reason for some low faculty support. Incorporate in this study an investigation of what other academic libraries are doing to maintain a "study atmosphere."

7) Do a follow-up study in three to five years, following the implementation of some of these recommendations, to see if faculty support has increased.

With an excellent library collection, an LRC staff dedicated to service, and active LRC patrons in the persons of faculty and students, the educational atmosphere at Ricks College can exist on a high level. This study indicated some areas within faculty support where improvement can be made. Improvement of this magnitude does not take place overnight. However, through a conscientious and continuing effort, changes can begin and over a given period of time, real differences can occur.

REFERENCES CITED

Allen, Kenneth W. Use of Community College Libraries. Linnet Books, 1971.

Best, John W. Research in Education. 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.

Biggs, Mary. "Sources of Tension and Conflict Between Librarians and Faculty." The Journal of Higher Education, March/April 1981, pp. 182-201.

Borg, Walter R. and Meredith D. Gall. Educational Research. 3rd ed. New York: Longman, Inc., 1979.

Carpenter, Raymond L. "Two-Year College Libraries: A Comparative Analysis in Terms of the ACRL Standards." College and Research Libraries, September, 1981, pp. 407-415.

Davis, Jinnie Y. and Stella Bentley. "Factors Affecting Faculty Perceptions of Academic Libraries." College and Research Libraries, November, 1979, pp. 527-532.

Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.

Gratch, Bonnie. Student and Faculty Use Survey: Final Report. State University of New York College at Brockport. ERIC ED 194 099, 1980.

Gwinn, Nancy E. "The Faculty-Library Connection." Change, September 1978, pp. 19-21.

Hofmann, Lucinda A. "Educate the Educator: A Possible Solution to an Academic Librarian's Dilemma." Journal of Academic Librarianship, July 1981, pp. 161-163.

Kilpatrick, Janet L. "Quality of Student Research Enriched by Librarian/Faculty Cooperation." North Carolina Libraries, Fall 1980, pp. 9-13.

Longsdon, R. H. "The Librarian and the Scholar: Eternal Enemies." Library Journal, 15 September 1970, pp. 2871-74.

"LRC Inventory." Compiled Statistics Report, 1983.

Lubans, John, Jr. Educating the Library User. New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1974.

Lubans, John, Jr. Progress in Educating the Library User. New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1978.

Lyle, Guy R. The Administration of the College Library. 4th ed. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1974.

Lynch, Beverly P. and Seibert, Karen S. "The Involvement of the Librarian in the Total Educational Process." Library Trends, Summer 1980, pp. 127-138.

MacVean, Donald S. Faculty Use of a University Library Circulating Book Collection. ERIC ED 157 561, 1978.

"Mission Statement." Learning Resources Center. Ricks College, Rexburg, Idaho, 21 June 1979.

Nelson, Jerold. "Faculty Awareness and Attitudes Toward Academic Library Reference Services: A Measure of Communication." College and Research Libraries, September, 1973, pp. 268-275.

Ostler, Larry. LRC Director, Personal interview, 14 Jan 1983.

Ostler, Larry. LRC Director, Personal interview, 18 May 1984.

Russell, Ralph E. and others. The Relationship of Documented Library Use to Academic Achievement, Program of Study, and Progress Toward a Degree. ERIC ED 220 045, 1982.

Sargent, Seymour H. "The Uses and Limitations of Trueswell." College and Research Libraries, September, 1979, pp. 416-423.

Scott, Norman M. and Robert J. Zabek. An Analysis of the Learning Resources Center. ERIC ED 156 293, 1977.

Thomson, Sarah Katharine. Learning Resource Centers in Community Colleges. Chicago: American Library Association, 1975.

Tierno, Mark J. and Joann H. Lee. "Developing and Evaluating Library Research Skills in Education: A Model for Course-Integrated Bibliographic Instruction." RQ, Spring 1983, pp. 284-291.

Whitlatch, Jo Bell. "Library Use Patterns Among Full- and Part-time Faculty and Students." College and Research Libraries, March 1983, pp. 141-152.

Wilson, Roger. A Faculty Survey of the Learning Resources Center at Virginia Western Community College. ERIC ED 125 728, 1976.

APPENDIX A

LRC FACULTY SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

FACULTY LRC SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Department:

2. Sex: a. Male b. Female

3. Age: a. 30 or under
b. 31-40
c. 41-50
d. 51-60
e. 61 or over

4. Highest degree obtained:
a. Less than Bachelor's
b. Bachelor's
c. Master's
d. Doctorate

5. How many years have you taught at Ricks:
a. 5 or less
b. 6-10
c. 11-15
d. 16-20
e. 21 or over

Answer questions 6-36 according to these answers. If any of the questions do not apply to you, leave them blank.
a. Very frequently
b. Frequently
c. Occasionally
d. Rarely
e. Never

6. How often is utilization of materials in the LRC necessary for students' success in your courses? (Use average of all courses if necessary.)

7. How often does the LRC book collection seem to fill your students' needs?

8. How often does the LRC periodical collection seem to fill your students' needs?

9. How often does the LRC index collection seem to fill your student's needs?

10. How often does the LRC reference collection seem to fill your students' needs?

11. How often does the LRC media collection seem to fill your students' needs?

12. In order to complete assigned work, how often do you require your students to use the LRC?

13. How often do you encourage your students to use the LRC for course work?

14. How often do you place books or audio-visual materials on reserve in the LRC?

15. How often will the use of the LRC help improve the grades of your students?

16. How often do your students understand how to locate the material they need?

17. How often do your students feel there is the problem of noise in the LRC? (Please explain if necessary.)

18. How often do you feel there is the problem of noise in the LRC? (Please explain if necessary.)

19. How often did you use a library facility in obtaining your bachelor's degree?

20. How often did you use a library facility in obtaining your master's degree?

21. How often did you use a library facility in obtaining your doctorate degree?

22. How often do you find the LRC collection to be adequate for you to perform your teaching responsibilities?

23. How often do you find the LRC collection to be adequate for your professional research activities?

24. How often do you find the LRC collection to be adequte for your leisure use?

25. How often do you use the LRC book collection?

26. How often do you use the LRC periodical collection?

27. How often do you use the LRC index/reference collection?

28. How often do you use the LRC audio-visual/media collection?

29. How often do you use the government documents collection?

30. How often have you had teaching materials prepared by you or for you in the media production area of the LRC?

31. How often are you satisfied with the service of the Audio-Visual Department (promptness of deliveries, condition of equipment, etc.? (Please explain if necessary.)

32. How often have you requested books or other materials for purchase by the LRC?

33. How often are you satisfied with the handling of your requests? (Please explain if necessary.)

34. When you need assistance in the LRC, how often do you ask for help?

35. How often do you receive quality help from a librarian? (Please explain if necessary.)

36. How often do you receive quality help from a student library assistant? (Please explain if necessary.)

37. How well could you teach your courses without the existence of the LRC?
    a. Very well
    b. Well
    c. Not very well
    d. Not at all

38. If an orientation workshop specifically designed to assist faculty in personally using the LRC were offered, would you be interested in attending?
    a. Yes b. No

39. If a workshop were held which would assist faculty in teaching their students about basic library usage, would you be interested in attending?
    a. Yes b. No

40. If a program were initiated wherein a librarian would be available to come and assist you in teaching library procedures to your students, would you be interested in participating?
    a. Yes b. No

41. If specific tours of the LRC were made available to your classes, how would you respond?
    a. Bring them to the LRC as a class.
    b. Send them to the LRC individually.
    c. My class does not need a tour of the LRC.
    d. Library orientation should be a part of the general college orientation.
    e. Other (please explain)

42. Which title do you prefer?
    a. Library
    b. LRC
    c. Either
    d. Other (please explain)

43. Please offer any other suggestion you may have for the improvement of library service. Or, if there is anything in particular that you really like in what the LRC is doing, please comment.

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER FOR FACULTY SURVEY

DAVID O. McKAY LEARNING RESOURCES CENTER

RICKS COLLEGE

March 24, 1983

Dear Faculty:

The LRC is continually trying to improve its collection and service. In an effort to make a current evaluation, the enclosed questionnaire for faculty input has been devised by Neal Southwick as part of his Ed.D. work for Nova University. Your consideration in taking a few minutes to respond to it is appreciated. DO NOT INCLUDE YOUR NAME. THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS ANONYMOUS.

Please use the accompanying computer score sheet on which to mark your answers with a #2 pencil. If a change in answers is needed, make sure you erase the old mark completely. If any of the questions do not apply to you please leave them blank. Also, write any comments you have on this sheet rather than the computer score sheet.

If you would send your completed questionnaire back to me by April 5th, it would be most helpful. Do not fold the computer sheet. You can return it in the same large envelope. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Larry Ostler, Director
Learning Resources Center

LO/ly

Enclosure

Rexburg, Idaho 83440 / Telephone: Area Code 208-356-2351

APPENDIX C

ALLEN STUDY FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questionnaire will enable your college library to provide better service to meet student and faculty needs. Please answer the following questions. The information gathered will only be generalized and will not be individualized.

1. HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED:

   (a) High School ☐ (d) Master's ☐
   (b) 2-year Associate ☐ (e) C.A.S. or Master's + 30 ☐
   (c) Baccalaureate ☐ (f) Doctorate ☐

2. MAJOR DIVISION IN WHICH TEACHING:

   (a) Humanities ☐ (d) Occupational ☐
   (b) Social Studies ☐ (e) Physical Education ☐
   (c) Mathematics & Science ☐

3. Do you feel that library utilization is necessary for the student's success in the courses you are teaching? YES ☐ NO ☐

4. Do you feel the library collection is adequate for students' needs? YES ☐ NO ☐

5. Do you feel that you could effectively teach your courses without the college library? YES ☐ NO ☐

6. Do you feel that your teaching techniques are affected because of lack of library materials? YES ☐ NO ☐

7. With what frequency do you *expect* your students to use the college library?

   (a) Daily ☐ (b) Weekly ☐ (c) Monthly ☐ (d) Never ☐

8. Do you *require* your students to use the library? YES ☐ NO ☐

9. Do you currently have books or audio-visual materials on reserve in the library? YES ☐ NO ☐

10. Does the collection meet your individual research needs? YES ☐ NO ☐

11. Do you recommend titles for acquisition by the library? YES ☐ NO ☐

APPENDIX D

TABULATION OF SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
ALL QUESTIONS, ALL FACULTY

LRC SURVEY

2. Sex?	#	%
a. Male	124	80
b. Female	31	20
c. no response	0	0

3. Age?	#	%
a. 30 or under	8	5
b. 31 - 40	32	21
c. 41 - 50	74	48
d. 51 - 60	37	24
e. 61 or over	4	3
f. No response	0	0

4. Highest degree obtained?	#	%
a. Less than Bachelor's	0	0
b. Bachelor's	12	8
c. Master's	96	62
d. Doctorate	47	30
e. No response	0	0

5. Years taught at Ricks	#	%
a. 5 or less	32	21
b. 6-10	17	11
c. 11-15	65	42
d. 16-20	25	16
e. 21 or over	16	10
f. No response	0	0

6. Utilization necessary for student success?	#	%
a. Very frequently	28	18
b. Frequently	47	30
c. Occasionally	55	35
d. Rarely	21	14
e. Never	2	1
f. No response	2	1

7. Book collection fills your students' needs?	#	%
a. Very frequently	12	8
b. Frequently	62	40
c. Occasionally	48	31
d. Rarely	18	12
e. Never	2	1
f. No response	13	8

8. Periodical collection fills students' needs?	#	%
a. Very frequently	10	6
b. Frequently	55	35
c. Occasionally	45	29
d. Rarely	27	17
e. Never	2	1
f. No response	16	10

9. Index collection fills your students' needs?	#	%
a. Very frequently	8	5
b. Frequently	47	30
c. Occasionally	51	33
d. Rarely	20	13
e. Never	3	2
f. No response	26	17

10. Reference collection fills students' needs?	#	%
a. Very frequently	15	10
b. Frequently	56	36
c. Occasionally	45	29
d. Rarely	15	10
e. Never	1	1
f. No response	23	15

11. Media collection fills your students' needs?	#	%
a. Very frequently	23	15
b. Frequently	51	33
c. Occasionally	33	21
d. Rarely	15	10
e. Never	2	1
f. No response	31	20

12. Students required to use LRC to complete work?	#	%
a. Very frequently	20	13
b. Frequently	37	24
c. Occasionally	59	38
d. Rarely	26	17
e. Never	9	6
f. No response	4	3

13. You encourage students to use LRC?	#	%
a. Very frequently	26	17
b. Frequently	45	29
c. Occasionally	49	32
d. Rarely	27	17
e. Never	4	3
f. No response	4	3

14. You place audio-visual materials on reserve?	#	%
a. Very frequently	29	19
b. Frequently	33	21
c. Occasionally	44	28
d. Rarely	34	22
e. Never	12	8
f. No response	3	2

15. Will LRC use improve grades of students?	#	%
a. Very frequently	35	23
b. Frequently	45	29
c. Occasionally	45	29
d. Rarely	19	12
e. Never	2	1
f. No response	9	6

16. Students understand how to locate materials?	#	%
a. Very frequently	5	3
b. Frequently	37	24
c. Occasionally	65	42
d. Rarely	16	10
e. Never	0	0
f. No response	32	21

17. Students feel there is a noise problem in LRC?	#	%
a. Very frequently	31	20
b. Frequently	46	30
c. Occasionally	27	17
d. Rarely	9	6
e. Never	0	0
f. No response	42	27

18. You feel there is a noise problem in LRC?	#	%
a. Very frequently	35	23
b. Frequently	45	29
c. Occasionally	36	23
d. Rarely	10	6
e. Never	3	2
f. No response	26	17

19. You used library for bachelor's?	#	%
a. Very frequently	48	31
b. Frequently	56	36
c. Occasionally	40	26
d. Rarely	5	3
e. Never	2	1
f. No response	4	3

20. You used library for master's?	#	%
a. Very frequently	95	61
b. Frequently	30	19
c. Occasionally	10	6
d. Rarely	2	1
e. Never	3	2
f. No response	15	10

21. You used library for doctorate?	#	%
a. Very frequently	44	28
b. Frequently	10	6
c. Occasionally	2	1
d. Rarely	2	1
e. Never	5	3
f. No response	92	59

22. LRC collection adequate for teaching needs?	#	%
a. Very frequently	19	12
b. Frequently	74	48
c. Occasionally	32	21
d. Rarely	15	10
e. Never	1	1
f. No response	14	9

23. LRC collection adequate for professional research	#	%
a. Very frequently	3	2
b. Frequently	29	19
c. Occasionally	51	33
d. Rarely	37	24
e. Never	7	5
f. No response	28	18

24. LRC collection adequate for leisure use?	#	%
a. Very frequently	20	13
b. Frequently	68	44
c. Occasionally	44	28
d. Rarely	8	5
e. Never	2	1
f. No response	13	8

25. You use book collection?	#	%
a. Very frequently	22	14
b. Frequently	39	25
c. Occasionally	62	40
d. Rarely	29	19
e. Never	1	1
f. No response	2	1

26. You use periodical collection?	#	%
a. Very frequently	14	9
b. Frequently	45	29
c. Occasionally	57	37
d. Rarely	31	20
e. Never	5	3
f. No response	3	2

27. You use index/reference collection?	#	%
a. Very frequently	9	6
b. Frequently	25	16
c. Occasionally	70	45
d. Rarely	39	25
e. Never	7	5
f. No response	5	3

28. You use audio-visual/ media collection?	#	%
a. Very frequently	29	19
b. Frequently	54	35
c. Occasionally	42	27
d. Rarely	23	15
e. Never	6	4
f. No response	1	1

29. You use government documents collection?	#	%
a. Very frequently	1	1
b. Frequently	11	7
c. Occasionally	26	17
d. Rarely	61	39
e. Never	54	35
f. No response	2	1

30. Materials prepared in media production area?	#	%
a. Very frequently	10	6
b. Frequently	22	14
c. Occasionally	52	34
d. Rarely	40	26
e. Never	29	19
f. No response	2	1

31. Satisfied with service of Audio-Visual Dept.?	#	%
a. Very frequently	59	38
b. Frequently	66	43
c. Occasionally	13	8
d. Rarely	4	3
e. Never	1	1
f. No response	12	8

32. You request LRC to purchase materials?	#	%
a. Very frequently	23	15
b. Frequently	44	28
c. Occasionally	58	37
d. Rarely	17	11
e. Never	10	6
f. No response	3	2

33. Satisfied with handling of requests?	#	%
a. Very frequently	45	29
b. Frequently	64	41
c. Occasionally	25	16
d. Rarely	4	3
e. Never	0	0
f. No response	17	11

34. When you need assistance do you ask for help?	#	%
a. Very frequently	24	15
b. Frequently	76	49
c. Occasionally	44	28
d. Rarely	8	5
e. Never	0	0
f. No response	3	2

35. Receive quality help from librarian?	#	%
a. Very frequently	55	35
b. Frequently	74	48
c. Occasionally	13	8
d. Rarely	5	3
e. Never	0	0
f. No response	8	5

36. Receive quality help from student assistant?	#	%
a. Very frequently	12	8
b. Frequently	45	29
c. Occasionally	53	34
d. Rarely	23	15
e. Never	2	1
f. No response	20	13

37. How well could you teach without LRC?	#	%
a. Very well	18	12
b. Well	55	35
c. Not very well	59	38
d. Not at all	20	13
e. No response	3	2

38. Want a faculty workshop on of LRC/	#	%
a. Yes	95	61
b. No	57	37
c. No response	3	2

39. Want a faculty workshop teaching how to use LRC?	#	%
a. Yes	81	52
b. No	69	45
c. No response		

40. Want librarian to assist in teaching about LRC?	#	%
a. Yes	84	54
b. No	67	43
c. No response	4	3

41. If there was an LRC tour how would you respond?	#	%
a. Bring to LRC	32	21
b. Send to LRC	35	23
c. Does not need tour	19	12
d. Should be gen. orient	56	36
e. Other	5	3
f. No response	8	5

42. Which title do you prefer?	#	%
a. Library	99	64
b. LRC	27	17
c. Either	27	17
d. Other	1	1
e. No response	1	1

43. Suggestions about LRC?	#	%
a. Comment made	53	34
b. No comment made	102	66

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON SURVEY

17. How often do your students feel there is the problem of noise in the LRC? (Please explain if necessary.)

"Too many people are allowed to talk. You need very strict monitors for a year to clean it up."

"I receive comments that there is no quiet place in the LRC to study"

"Many students complain about excessive noise."

"Do your own survey of the students leaving the library."

"Better this year!"

"Don't like to study there because of noise."

18. How often do you feel there is the problem of noise in the LRC? (Please explain if necessary.)

"I have never heard anyone come around and tell students to be quiet."

"I try not to go there."

"Too much use of library for socializing, entertainment (TV and computer) by student."

31. How often are you satisfied with the service of the Audio-Visual Department (promptness of deliveries, condition of equipment, etc.)? (Please explain if necessary.)

"Some of the equipment is old and doesn't work too well, mainly cassette players."

"We have really had problems this year."

"Record players are very poor quality."

"Your tape and record collections are in sad shape. Out of a dozen tapes selected from the listed printout - 50% had wrong numbers."

"Very few films of a business nature, this is very lacking, most films are church oriented."

33. How often are you satisfied with the handling of your requests? (Please explain if necessary.)

"Very good. Appreciate it!"

"Slow:

"I had to go check three different times if it had been ordered - I was sent to different people to check on it."

"Seems like it takes too long to get books that I order, i.e. the last one took three months and two long distance phone calls by me to help locate it."

35. How often do you receive quality help from a librarian? (Please explain if necessary.)

"Always get the help I need."

"Roger is the only one I've dealt with - he's excellent! Tom has helped me a few times - he is fine."

"Roger McPheeters is of great help."

"They are very helpful. Usually they go the extra mile."

"When I do ask for help I receive good assistance from a librarian."

"Excellent"

36. How often do you receive quality help from a student library assistant? (Please explain if necessary.)

"Student help is often not well trained."

"Try not to deal with them."

"When I ask for help I receive good assistance."

"Usually don't know where things are."

"I never ask a student."

"I usually go to the bosses. My students complain about quality of student help."

"As good a help as I would expect from students. If they don't know they ask the professional help."

43. Please offer any other suggestion you may have for the improvement of library service. Or, if there is anything in particular that you really like in what the LRC is doing, please comment.

"More periodical coverage in technical areas."

"The library may be good in Jr. College material, but there is very little for research in my field."

"Doing a great job."

"I am often disappointed when trying to find books. I appreciate the fine staff. I doubt you could find better."

"Call a spade a spade."

"I'd like to see a short course available to teach fundamentals of research (indexes, card catalogue, reference collection, etc.) required of all students."

"I would like to see the back stair wells beautiful - carpets on landings - pictures - greenery, etc. They are most ugly and depressing now - and are used by many!"

"I don't use it as often as I could or should. With skills course, a teacher must be creative to incorporate the need to use it - though I believe each student should learn to use it often."

"The Genealogy Library should be on the bottom floor and parking should be set aside for the elderly so they can get to the genealogy library. Open up the elevator so people can use it!"

"I think a library is a depository of knowledge. I'm disturbed when books are discarded without faculty consent."

"Other libraries do no have facilities to laminate and produce visuals like ours does. I think it is a great service and a necessary one. The visuals prepared by the LRC are great! I use them all the time."

"Loaning out tapes, records, etc. has been excellent, also showing video films at the LRC."

"More types of cross referencing for record and cassette tape collections, i.e. performers, compoers, title, medium, type of work, etc."

"I appreciate the helpfulness of the staff at LRC, particularly when I take classes there for research orientation. I'm disturbed that there is almost no information available to help students build a business plan; almost nothing at all on management of small business and no budget to improve the situation. Because of the distance to LRC and the many hours of labs, I've resorted to trying to build my own reference sources to supplement the LRC."

"I don't like the options on this questionnaire, it goes from "frequently" to "Occasionally" when I would answer most questions "usually" the gap is too wide. On No. 38 and 39 my answer would be "maybe" depending on content and timing. On No. 40 the answer would be emphatically yes. It's interesting that questionnaires rarely provide opportunity to comment. Why not send someone to interview and get our true feelings?"

"Please change the name to library. Why do we have such a fetish about names? All the students and townspeople call it the library. We would do well to join them."

"I like the reserve library. I can put materials in there relatively quickly. I get those materials back again when needed without a lot of red tape. The girl that works there is both helpful and friendly."

"Retain journals (don't throw them out)."

"Being able to order books that pertain to our area, thanks a million for your good work."

"I get the feeling that all are trying to provide the best service possible - attitude and helpfulness of staff."

"I like the new book corner initiated by Jerry Glenn. I would like to see the library kick out those noisy students. I think the periodical section is too open."

"I am impressed by the staff on their dedication, helpfulness, and friendliness. I wish we had more budget for research materials."

"The best thing about the library is the librarians. They have always impressed me as competent and willing. I find the student help generally very poor. The noise level is very high, the book slection (new books) very weak. I really like the move toward computers."

"I feel that we have an excellent library program."

"I find our professional librarians to be very friendly, prepared and competent. They're great!"

"A comment has been that periodicals were dropped due to lack of space. A recent visitor to LRC from another campus mentioned how much wasted space was present on the first floor. LRC shouldn't exist for student lounging - use the Manwaring Center for that. Media area very helpful."

"The nature of our Home economic classes does not always lend itself to LRC book research."

"I really like the Children's Book Section and the great map collection. I would like to see the general fiction area expanded."

"Suggestions made by Blaine Bake - helpfulness and positive attitudes of audio-visual staff."

"I do appreciate the help you have always given me."

"After I became more setteled in basic class preparation, I intend to use the LRC more for both students and personal needs."

"Students ought to learn how to use the library and the way to learn is to do it. Just hearing about how to use it is

not adequate. It would be very inefficient for the student to hear from a half dozen teachers each semester how to use the library. It would be expensive to hire sufficient personnel to teach a library class to all new students, but a taped audio-tutorial program could be developed which would allow the student to proceed at his own pace and complete one or more assignments."

"I have appreciated the fact that the library staff have always been willing to help me with my request. I have regretted the discarding of the card catalog - especially since there seems to be frequent problems with the computers. Microfiche has the advantage of compactness, but from a user's point of view is not as satisfactory - not as easy to read and totally inadequate where the color of the illustration is important. For that reason I also regret the loss of 'outdated' periodicals."

"I like the way we are kept informed about what is available in both materials and services. Keep up the good work."

"I would suggest a study area where absolute silence is the rule - one large room perhaps. I would discourage purchase of pop recordings intended only to study by. Music in background does not help any student to learn good study habits."

"I realize that the holdings are somewhat limited because of the nature of our institution - a junior college. I would like to see more control of periodicals. They occasionally are in a kind of chaotic condition with free student access. Is there a way they could be controlled in a reserve room and managed a bit more carefully - kept in order, etc. Overall, the service is good. I appreciate it."

"The friendliness of the library staff is unequaled anywhere."

"I think my answer reveals a great respect and appreciation of the services and help available at a wonderful library."